

THE CHURCH, WARFARE AND MILITARY OBLIGATION IN NORMAN ITALY

by G. A. LOUD

ONE OF the most important intellectual problems which the Church faced in the Middle Ages was to reconcile warfare with the Christian message. But the presence of, and the necessity for, war affected not merely the intellectual attitudes and social message of medieval ecclesiastics. The institutional Church faced obvious practical problems when confronted with external warfare or civil disturbance. On the one hand the ruler might well, indeed usually did, require churches with extensive property and wealth to contribute to the burden of defending the community. On the other hand churches might well, especially if the ruler's authority was weak, face the need to defend themselves against the aggression of their neighbours. Churches therefore needed a military potential, whether or not the state laid this obligation upon them. Even the Church's attempts to control warfare, the Peace and Truce of God movements, tended to embroil it in military activity, since exhortation and spiritual sanction often needed the backing of force to convince a recalcitrant laity of the virtues of bridling its internal violence.¹

The majority of secular rulers, as well as most churchmen, would probably have agreed that ideally the Church ought to be free of this most secular and undesirable of involvements. But in practice, given the institutional wealth and power of the Church, this was neither possible nor desirable. In return for their property and privileges churches had to contribute their share to the obligations of society, including those burdens connected with warfare. The complexities to which this issue could give rise can be well-illustrated by study of the Church in southern Italy in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

When the Normans overran the area in the eleventh century,

I would like to thank Dr Chris Wickham for his advice on certain aspects of this paper.

¹ H. Hoffman, *Gottesfriede und Treuga Dei* (MGH *Schriften* 20, Stuttgart 1964) pp 104-129.

neither in the Lombard principalities of the west nor in the Byzantine theme of Langobardia were churches usually subject to formal military obligations, although they might not be wholly free from the indirect effects of such burdens. In the Lombard principalities ecclesiastical tenants might well be liable for service in their own right, and church lands were subject to *corvées* connected with the levying of the host.² Churches in the area of Byzantine rule had to pay the *strateia*, a contribution intended to finance military activities.³

The Norman invaders brought with them the alien concepts of fief and vassalage; the former unknown and the latter hitherto hardly-assimilated in the south, which had never fallen under the Carolingian yoke.⁴ But they were generous to the Church, both with donations and with grants of immunity from all types of secular obligation. In most, and probably all, of southern Italy the rulers intended that the Church should be exempt from the provision of military contingents. Such was the case even on the island of Sicily immediately after its conquest from the Arabs, although there was still a very substantial Muslim population there, and as yet no large-scale Christian immigration.⁵ Similarly, when lands held in fief were given to churches in the Norman principality of Capua they were freed from the obligation of service.⁶ In a legal case of 1149 a layman claimed that his grandfather's performance of military service for a tenement showed that this could not have been owned by a church.⁷

² On the personal nature of military service in Lombard south Italy, [C.] Cahen, [*Le Régime Féodal de l'Italie Normande* (Paris 1940)] pp 28–30. The Lombard princes were reluctant to grant exemptions to individuals, even when giving them immunity from other public burdens, e.g. A. Gallo, 'I Diplomi dei principi langobardi di Benevento, di Capua e di Salerno nella traduzione Cassinese' *BISIMEAM* 52 (1937) pp 71–2 no 3. Pandulf I exempted the oxen and carts of Montecassino from carrying services with the host in 961, [E.] Gattula, *Accessiones [ad Historiam Abbatiae Casinensis]* (Venice 1734)] pp 58–9.

³ S. Borsari, 'Istituzioni feudali e parafeudali nella puglia bizantina' *A[rchivio] s[torico per le provincie] nap[oletane]* 77 (Naples 1959) pp 131–4.

⁴ Cahen, *Régime Féodal* pp 41–51.

⁵ [L. T.] White, *Latin Monasticism [in Norman Sicily]* (Cambridge, Mass. 1938)] pp 62–3.

⁶ *Reg[esto] di S. Angelo [in Formis]*, ed. M. Inguauez (Montecassino 1925)] pp 100–2 no 34 (1099), a charter of prince Richard II, cf. *Cod[ice] Dipl[omatico Normanno di] Aversa*, [ed. A. Gallo (Naples 1927)] pp 399–401 no 53 (1073).

⁷ *Reg. S. Angelo* pp. 207–212 no. 73. An English summary is given by [E. M.] Jamison, ['The] Norman Administration [of Apulia and Capua, most especially under Roger II and William I 1127–1166', *Papers of the British School at Rome* vi (London 1913)] pp 426–7 no 29.

Military obligation in Norman Italy

This is not to say that churches did not possess a military capability. The tenth-century evidence is often indirect, but nonetheless convincing. A series of grants from the Princes of Capua and Benevento in the years after 960 allowed churches to build or to possess fortifications.⁸ A spate of modern work, most notably that of Pierre Toubert, has stressed that the primary purpose of the *incastellamento* of central and southern Italy at this period was the economic development of hitherto under-utilized territory.⁹ But it is very difficult to separate the development of fortified centres from considerations of defence and military activity, and in a recent article Toubert himself has admitted that perhaps he has underestimated the military aspect of the *incastellamento*.¹⁰ In the charter of Pandulf I of Capua to the abbey of Montecassino of 967 conceding the regalian right of fortification three sites are specifically named. Two, S. Angelo in Theodice and S. Giorgio a Liri were *castra* proper, that is fortified villages. The third, Rocca Janula, was a fortress pure and simple, designed to protect the approach to the abbey itself.¹¹ A similar fortress was built for strategic purposes by Abbot Manso of Cassino at Roccasecca in 995, a site the name of which shows that it was hardly the most suitable for habitation.¹² The abbey chronicle described Manso as habitually accompanied by a retinue of cavalry (*equites*). His successor, Abbot John II, personally led the attack which in 997 ravaged and burnt the township (*municipium*) of Pignatiero, which had rebelled against the monks' rule. Abbot Atenulf, c1019, sent soldiers to drive the Counts of Venafrò from the *castra* of Vitescuso and Aquafundata.¹³

⁸ R. Poupardin, *Etude sur les Institutions politiques et administratives des Princeautés Lombardes de l'Italie meridionale (IX-XI siècles)* (Paris 1907) pp 108-10, 113, 115 nos 120, 121, 124, 131, 136. The best text of no 121 (967) is now *Chron[icon] Vulf[er]mense*, ed. V. Federici (3 vols, *Fonti per la storia d'Italia* 58-60, Rome 1924-38)] 2 pp 162-4.

⁹ P. Toubert, *Les Structures du Latium médiéval. Le Latium méridional et la Sabine du IX^e siècle à la fin du XII^e siècle* (2 vols, Rome 1973) 1 pp 303-368.

¹⁰ [P.] Toubert, 'Pour une histoire [de l'environnement économique et social du Mont-Cassin (IX^e-XII^e siècles)] *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* (Paris 1976)] p 701.

¹¹ L. Tosti, *Storia della Badia di Montecassino* (3 vols, Naples 1842) 1 pp 226-8. For Rocca Janula see the pre-1944 photograph [L.] Fabiani, [*La*] *Terra [di S. Benedetto]* (2 vols, *Miscellanea Cassinese* 33-4, Montecassino 1968)] 1 facing p 64.

¹² *Chron[ica] Monasterii Cas[in]ensis*, ed. H. Hoffmann, *MGH SS* 34 (1980)] bk 2 cap 14, pp 194-5. See F. Scandone, 'Roccasecca. Patria di S. Tommaso d'Aquino'. *Archivio storico di Terra di Lavoro* i (Caserta 1956) 33 seq.

¹³ *Chron Cas* bk 2 caps 16, 20, 37, pp 196, 204, 240.

Two factors led to a growth in military involvement by the churches of southern Italy in the years after 950. First, the Lombard princes deliberately conceded land and regalian rights, above all that of fortification, to the great abbeys in an attempt to provide a counterweight to a restive lay nobility.¹⁴ Secondly, there was the arrival of the Normans. Churches with extensive landed holdings had to defend them during the turbulent generation (c1020–1050) in which the newcomers established themselves in the Campania, Samnium and northern Apulia. Montecassino succeeded in doing this, but the other great abbey of the principality of Capua, St. Vincent on Volturno, was less successful, and many of its lands and *castra* were permanently lost.¹⁵ When in the second half of the century the Normans moved into the Abruzzi, the abbey of St. Clement of Casauria similarly developed and utilised a very considerable military capacity. Vigorous fortification of the abbey itself and of its lands was undertaken, the abbots personally led the defence, and indeed c1124 Abbot Gizo was alleged to have mustered as many as 4000 armed men to recover some of the monastery lands.¹⁶ That the great abbeys which possessed extensive franchises should have, in this disturbed period, troops of their own to defend themselves is hardly surprising. Evidence for a wider clerical involvement in military affairs is more difficult to discover. Nonetheless, whatever the immunities conceded to churches by lay rulers, it seems probable that many of them in fact had troops of their own. For example, the bishops of Troia and Acherenza were killed fighting on the side of the Byzantines against the Norman invaders of Apulia at Montemaggiore in 1041.¹⁷ They were hardly likely to have been unaccompanied. The bishop of Cassano led Calabrian attempts to resist the Normans in 1059.¹⁸ Similarly the bishop of S. Agata dei Goti was part of the army with which Prince Robert II of Capua and Count Rainulf of

¹⁴ J.-M. Martin, 'Elements préfodaux dans les Princeautés de Bénévent et de Capoue (fin du VIII^e siècle—début du XI^e siècle): modalités de privatisation du pouvoir' *Structures féodales et féodalisme dans l'Occident méditerranéen (X^e–XIII^e siècles)* (Rome 1980) pp 574–5.

¹⁵ Fabiani, *Terra* 1 pp 63–83. Toubert, 'Pour une histoire' pp 697–700. *Chron Vult* 1 p 231, 3 pp 78–9, 84. M. del Treppo, 'La vita economica e sociale in una grande abbazia del Mezzogiorno. S. Vincenzo al Volturno nell'alto medioevo' *ASNap* 74 (1956) 101–11.

¹⁶ *Chron[icon] Casauriense*, [Muratori 2(2)] cols 865–6, 880–1, 882 (Abbot Gizo), 885–6.

¹⁷ *Annales Barenses*, MGH SS 5 p 54.

¹⁸ Geoffrey Malaterra, *De Rebus Gestis Rogerii Calabriae et Siciliae Comitis*, ed. E. Pontieri, Muratori new edn. (1925–8) bk 1 cap 32, p 22.

Military obligation in Norman Italy

Alife defeated Roger II of Sicily at Nocera in 1132.¹⁹ Very few charters of enfeoffment survive from Norman Italy, but one which does was given by the abbey of St. Lawrence, Aversa, in that same year of 1132.²⁰ The early twelfth century was a period in which the government of the princes of Capua and the dukes of Apulia was becoming less and less effective, and the 1130s saw a civil war in southern Italy as Roger II strove to unify the whole area under his rule. There was thus a real need for churches to be able to defend themselves.

Of course the Church could employ moral and spiritual as well as temporal weapons. One device which the great monasteries used was to secure oaths from lay rulers and nobles to defend and protect their property. Montecassino in particular adopted this practice, but in the early twelfth century so too did Casauria and La Cava, near Salerno.²¹ The Peace and Truce of God came late to southern Italy, under papal auspices at the Councils of Melfi in 1089 and Troia in 1093.²² But in the years after this some local bishops attempted to promote them. In 1105, when the duchy of Gaeta was riven by internal dispute, Bishop Albert secured an agreement from all the contending parties, including the duke, Richard de l'Aigle, to protect the property and personnel of the Church.²³ At about the same time four Abruzzi bishops combined together to excommunicate a local count who had, among other sins, attacked church lands. The biographer of one of these prelates, Bishop Bernard of Marsia, particularly praised his hero's attempts to bring concord to those quarrelling.²⁴ But there can be little doubt that when the lay ruler was unwilling or unable to help, churches had to be prepared to defend themselves by physical as well as spiritual means.

¹⁹ *Monumenta Bambergensia*, ed. P. Jaffe (Bibliotheca Rerum Germanicarum 5, Berlin 1868) pp 442-4 no 259.

²⁰ *Cod Dipl Aversa* pp 51-2 no 31.

²¹ G. A. Loud, 'Five unpublished charters of the Norman Princes of Capua', *Benedictina* 27 (Rome 1980) pp 173-4 no 3 (1099). Gattula. *Accessiones* pp 222 (1105), 225 (1106-7), 229 (1112), 239 (1123). G. Tescione, *Roberto, Conte normanno di Alife, Caiazzo e S. Agata dei Goti* (Caserta 1975) pp 46-7 no 3 (1094-1105), 49 no 5 (1105). A. de Francesco, 'Origini e sviluppo del feudalismo in Molise' *ASNap* 34 (1909) pp 669 n 1, 670 n 1. *Cod[ex] Dipl[omaticus] Caiet[anus]* (4 vols, Montecassino 1887-1960) 2 pp 178-80 no 282 (1107). All of these were to Montecassino. *Chron Casauriense* col 1006. [Archivio della badia di S. Trinita di] Cava [dei Tirreni.] *Arm. Mag.* E. 21 (1111).

²² Lupus Protospatharius, *Annales* ad. an. 1089, MGH SS 5 p 62. Mansi 20 col 790.

²³ *Cod Dipl Caiet* 2 pp 174-6 no 280.

²⁴ *Vita Sancti Berardi*, *ASB* Nov 2 (1894) pp 133-4.

The position changed with the successful incorporation of the whole of southern Italy into a unified kingdom by Roger II. The state was both willing and able to defend its churches. The question was rather what contribution the Church was to make to the defence of the state.

The king of Sicily faced both the problem of maintaining his internal control over the disparate parts of his dominions, and that of defending the *regno* against his external enemies. With relations with the papacy uncertain, both the Eastern and Western Empires hostile, and political exiles including the former prince of Capua ready to exploit any internal difficulties to regain their position, this latter consideration was naturally of major importance. Hence in the early 1140s, perhaps during his long stay at Silva Marca in Apulia in the summer of 1142, king Roger began a major reorganization of military obligations on the mainland, creating a special and extensive category of fiefs owing service directly to the monarch.²⁵ Almost certainly connected with this was a law, the details of which are known from a later revival by Frederick II, which forbade alienations to the Church which would lead to a diminution in such service.²⁶

These measures were part of a much wider, and very determined, royal campaign to prevent the alienation of regalian rights as a whole. In 1144 a full-scale investigation into the validity of existing privileges was undertaken.²⁷ At about the same time a general decree was promulgated against the alienation of regalia, which was incorporated in both of the surviving manuscripts which purport to contain king Roger's legislation.²⁸ Ecclesiastical franchises were particularly affected by the king's determination to reserve criminal jurisdiction, at least, even in the case of the most

²⁵ [E. M.] Jamison, 'Additional work [on the *Catalogus Baronum*]' *BISIMEAM* 83 (1971) pp 15-17.

²⁶ *Liber Augustalis* bk 3 cap 29, 'De rebus stabilibus non alienandis', *Die Konstitution Friedrichs II von Hohenstaufen für sein Königreich Sizilien*, edd. H. Conrad, T. von der Lieck Buyken & W. Wagner (Cologne 1973) pp 284-6. White, *Latin Monasticism* p 62 dates this simply 'before 1148'.

²⁷ [K. A.] Kehr, [*Die Urkunden der normannisch-sizilischen Könige* (Innsbruck 1902)] pp 348, 424-7 nos 10-11.

²⁸ Clause 4 of the Vatican MS (Cod. Vat. Lat. 8782), and clause 3 of the Cassinese (Cod. Cas. 468), F. Brandileone, *Il Diretto romano nelle legge normanni e sveve del regno di Sicilia* (Turin 1884) pp 97, 120. The Cassinese, the later of these two sets of assizes, must be dated before 1153, [E. M.] Jamison, ['The administration of the County of] Molise [in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries] I', *EHR* 44 (1929) pp 548-552, 556-7.

Military obligation in Norman Italy

privileged churches, over really serious crimes, a resolve equally strongly maintained by Roger's successors.²⁹ The regalian right over fortifications was also revived and strengthened, and in some cases, notably the abbey of Montecassino, churches were deprived of some of their strongholds.³⁰

Henceforth property which was part of a fief owing military service could only be given to a church on one of three conditions. Either the former lay owner remained responsible for the service, or the church was exempted by the king from the service owed, or the church was henceforth itself responsible for the service. Exemptions were occasionally given. For example, in December 1156 king William I gave the archbishop and cathedral of Palermo the fief of Broccato, and exempted both the demesne and the tenants from knight service.³¹ But from the king's point of view such generosity was much less serious on the island of Sicily than in the mainland provinces, especially in those near to his vulnerable northern frontier. Hence, as part of the organization of the defence of the realm in the 1140s churches which had hitherto been free of the burden of military obligations to the lay ruler found themselves subject to them. As one of the royal constables, Count Bohemond of Manopello, said to an Abruzzi abbot dissatisfied with this new state of affairs, 'the lord king . . . has many who pray for him in his kingdom, but few who fight'.³²

The defensive resources of the kingdom at the end of king Roger's reign were recorded in a text, now universally known as the *Catalogus Baronum*, drawn up c1150, and revised c1167.³³ This recorded the fiefs both of churchmen and of laymen in all the mainland provinces except Calabria. But the role of the Church in the *Catalogus* raises certain problems which have not been fully elucidated.

²⁹ E.g. [R.] Pirro, [*Sicula Sacra* (2 vols, Palermo 1733)] 2 pp 1021-2 (1144) for the monastery of S. Angelo di Brolo; *ibid* 2 pp 1046-7 (1145) for S. Maria Annunziata of Mandanici; *ibid* 1 p 109 (1177), William II to the archbishop of Palermo; *ibid* 2 p 935 (1209), Frederick II to the Hospitaller priory of Messina. Cf. Fabiani, *Terra* 2 pp 19-20, 39-41.

³⁰ *Annales Casinenses* ad. an. 1140, *MGH SS* 19 p 309.

³¹ Pirro 1 pp 97-8.

³² *Chron Casauriense* col 892.

³³ *Cat[alogus] Bar[onum]*, ed. E. M. Jamison (Fonti per la storia d'Italia 101, Rome 1972).] Its editor is very insistent, 'Additional work' pp 3-7, that it was not 'a mere register of normal military service', but a record of the *magna expeditio*, the extraordinary defensive military levy.

To begin with, only twenty-two churches are in fact recorded.³⁴ Quite a few of these are, as one might expect, in the Abruzzi, since this was the most vulnerable area threatened by an imperial invasion. E. M. Jamison has shown that in some cases property which was ultimately held by churches was recorded in the *Catalogus* under the names of lay tenants, responsible for the service not to the churches but to lay tenants-in-chief. The examples which she cites are the bishop of Aprutium and the abbeys of Casauria and St. John in Venere. Ultimate proprietorship, and part of the revenues and other services remained with the church.³⁵ This practice was quite widespread in the Abruzzi region. To the cases advanced by Jamison one can add others. Thus three fiefs listed in a royal charter of 1185 as the property of the bishop of Valva were shown in the *Catalogus* as being held by laymen, one in chief and two by a sub-tenant.³⁶ What is also very interesting here is that while the bishop of Aprutium and the abbeys of Casauria and St. John in Venere were all listed as holding fiefs in their own right,³⁷ the bishop of Valva was not. There may be the slight possibility that these particular territories were acquired by the see after the compilation of the *Catalogus*. We know for example that the bishopric was given another fief, for which knight service was owed, by Henry VI in 1195.³⁸ But if that was the case, what contribution did the bishop of Valva make to the defence of the realm in the time of Roger II? One suspects that in the Abruzzi lay tenants-in-chief and their vassals were very commonly responsible for the service from church lands, but to confirm the ubiquity of this practice systematic investigation of the property of all the major churches would be needed. One factor which should certainly be stressed is that the presence of these laymen with fiefs on church land, and apparently very little connection with the churches in question, was not solely the result of pressure from the royal government to ensure that military service was performed. Sometimes this was the product of the forcible alienation by

³⁴ Cahen, *Régime Féodal* p 131.

³⁵ Jamison, 'Additional work' pp 18–21.

³⁶ Orsa, Prezza and Raiano, Kehr, *Urkunden* p 439 no 20 (there wrongly dated to 1170). For the correct date, N. Kamp, *Kirche und Monarchie im Staufischen Königreich Sizilien* (3 vols, Munich 1973–5) 1 p 61 n 6. Cf. *Cat Bar* pp 243, 245 arts 1188, 1195 (henceforth cited by article no only).

³⁷ *Cat Bar* arts 1204–8, 1217, 1221.

³⁸ [F.] Ughelli, [*Italia Sacra* (2nd ed, 10 vols, Venice 1717–22)] 1 cols 1129–30.

Military obligation in Norman Italy

laymen of church property, as for example the *castrum* of S. Velentino, seized by a certain Richard Turgisius from the monastery of Casauria in 1140, and recorded under his name in the *Catalogus Baronum*.³⁹ Another factor which might lead a church to have no apparent connection with military service rendered for land, which sources other than the Catalogue suggest was the property of that church, was genuine divided ownership. The complications of Lombard inheritance law meant that many *castra* in the Abruzzi were held in common. Hence a layman who held part of a property while a church had the rest might render service for the whole fief.⁴⁰

The church with the heaviest military obligation in its own right listed in the Catalogue was the abbey of Montecassino, recorded as providing 60 knights and 200 sergeants for the extraordinary levy.⁴¹ In this case the obligation was one for the whole extensive franchise held by the abbey, and not for any specific fiefs. The peculiar position of Montecassino was signified by the fact that whereas, normally, two sets of obligations were recorded, one a 'normal' quota, and the other with the *augmentum* showing the full total of knights actually available (a distinction also present in eleventh and twelfth century Normandy),⁴² only one figure is given in this case. The peculiar juridical position of Montecassino, maintained despite some interference with its franchise by Roger II, and its key strategic position on the Via Latina between Rome and Capua, help to explain this anomaly. When other churches were recorded in the Catalogue their obligation was usually for particular fiefs, and not for their land as a whole.⁴³ But within the huge Cassinese franchise, with its (by the mid-twelfth century) thirty three *castra* there was clearly a very substantial military class, and indeed quite an elaborate social structure within that class.⁴⁴

³⁹ *Chron Casauriense* cols 1008–9. *Cat Bar* art 1014.

⁴⁰ Hence the Abbot of St. Bartholomew, Carpineto, obtained Vicalvi by an exchange with the Bishop of Penne in 1123, Ughelli 1 col 1118, but later $\frac{1}{2}$ of this was held by a vassal of a lay tenant-in-chief, *Cat Bar* art 1196. For another example of a church holding $\frac{1}{2}$ of a *castrum* see *Chron Casauriense* col 1007 (1136).

⁴¹ *Cat Bar* art 823.

⁴² On the *augmentum*, Cahen, *Régime Féodal* pp 69–71. Cf. C. W. Hollister, *The Military Organization of Norman England* (Oxford 1965) pp 75–81.

⁴³ An exception is the monastery of St. John in Lamis, near Foggia, though here an *augmentum* is recorded, *Cat Bar* art 376.

⁴⁴ For the *castra* see the bull of Alexander III of 1159, PL 200 col 77. For the abbey knights

On what basis was it decided which church lands should be held in fief, and which in free tenure? As we have seen, even in the Abruzzi there is no great consistency in the obligations recorded in the *Catalogus Baronum*. Why did the bishops of Aprutium, Forcone and Penne owe service for fiefs, either held in demesne or by vassals, but not those of Chieti, Marsia and Valva? With regard to Valva it has been suggested that the answer may lie in fiefs for which the service was actually done by lay tenants, who, though performing the service for ecclesiastical land, were vassals of lay barons rather than of the church. But even if this element of 'hidden' service was widespread in the *Catalogus*, problems still remain. We know that lay fiefs existed on the land of the bishop of Aprutium, but the latter also held in chief a series of fiefs for which he himself owed, with the *augmentum*, 24 knights and 40 sergeants.⁴⁵

The problem becomes more complicated when one turns from the frontiers to Apulia. Here some prelates, the bishops of Tricarico, Civitate and Melfi, and the abbot of the Holy Trinity, Venosa, for example, held fiefs,⁴⁶ but the total represented only a small minority of the Apulian bishops and abbots. In the principality of Capua there are, with the exception of Montecassino, no ecclesiastical contingents listed at all. Was this because churches had always been firmly exempt from service in Capua, whereas in Apulia before 1140 this principle was less firmly applied? But I know of no pre-1140 instance of an Apulian church actually doing service to the duke for a fief. An obvious explanation might be that the fiefs for which Apulian churches owed service had been recently acquired, after the imposition of the new royal obligations in the early 1140s. In one case at least this seems to be correct. The abbot of St. Mary at Banzi is recorded as holding Banzi itself for three knights, or seven with the *augmentum*.⁴⁷ In 1153 Abbot Roger of Banzi was selling property, including a church, to the abbey of La Cava in return for a substantial sum in cash and precious goods which he proposed to

see the *Lex Municipalis* of Pontecorvo (1190), ed Fabiani, *Terra* 1 pp 427–30. There are elaborate thirteenth-century regulations for service, *ibid* 2 pp 176–9. In some of these, e.g. those for the *castrum* of S. Pietro in Fine, there are references to nobles; Montecassino, Archivio dell'abbazia, Registrum II Bernardi (Reg no 6) fol 13^v.

⁴⁵ *Cat Bar* art 1221.

⁴⁶ *ibid* arts 107, 386, 402, 408.

⁴⁷ *ibid* art 87.

Military obligation in Norman Italy

use to liquidate the debt owed to the king 'de castello Bancie'.⁴⁸ That the abbey had recently purchased Banzi and its territory is also suggested by its omission in two bulls of Paschal II listing the monastery's possessions, whereas it is recorded in a later bull of 1172.⁴⁹

But this was clearly not the case for every ecclesiastical fief recorded in the *Catalogus Baronum*. The bishop of Melfi owed, with the *augmentum*, 8 knights and 100 sergeants for the fief of Gaudiano, which had been given to his see as far back as 1097 by Duke Roger of Apulia. There was furthermore no mention of military service in the latter's donation charter, rather the duke exempted the property from all service and dues to the state.⁵⁰ Similarly, the abbot of Venosa owed his contingent for a series of fiefs, most of which had been given to his house by Counts Robert and William of the Principate between 1096 and 1105.⁵¹

It seems certain therefore that fiefs already owing military service which had been newly acquired by churches would still owe that service, unless specifically exempted by the king. But it is by no means clear what criteria were used to decide which property already owned by churches c1140 should henceforth be classed as royal fiefs for which service, and the accompanying financial obligations, were owed. Some churches may have been penalized for the indiscretion of their prelates during periodic moments of political crisis. Montecassino was distrusted by the Norman kings after it had thrown in its lot with the imperial invasion of 1137.⁵² But it is difficult to make any coherent connection—the abbots of Venosa were by no means out of favour at the royal court, and their church held the tombs of Robert Guiscard and other famous ancestors of the king.⁵³

⁴⁸ Cava, *Arm. Mag.* H. 15.

⁴⁹ P. F. Kehr, 'Papsturkunden in Salerno, La Cava und Neapel', *Nachrichten der K. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Phil.-hist. Klasse* (1900) pp 221–7 nos 2–3 (1102 & 1106). P. F. Kehr, 'Papsturkunden in Rom. Die römische Bibliotheken III', *ibid* (1903) pp 149–150 no 4 (1172).

⁵⁰ *Cat Bar* art 402; Ughelli 1 cols 923–4.

⁵¹ Corneto (1096 & 1105), half of Asoli Satriano (1098), Orta (1101) and S. Giovanni in Fronte (1105), L. R. Ménager, 'Les fondations monastiques de Robert Guiscard', *QFIAB* 39 (1959) pp 95–101 nos 21, 23–4, 27–8; *Cat Bar* art 408.

⁵² White, *Latin Monasticism* p 57. Most of the supposed royal diplomas for Montecassino are thirteenth-century forgeries, C.-R. Brühl, *Urkunden und Kanzlei König Rogers II von Sizilien* (Cologne 1978) pp 164–172.

⁵³ For Abbot Egidius of Venosa's influence, *La Historia o Liber de Regno Sicilie di Ugo Falcando*,

One criterion which might have been used was whether or not the church held regalian rights such as that of levying the *plateaticum* toll, which were normally conceded to holders of royal fiefs (*feuda in baronia* as they were later known) as a recompense for the service owed.⁵⁴ But the abbey of La Cava, which all but rivalled Montecassino as the richest and most extensive property holder among mainland monasteries, held both regalian fiscal rights as the *plateaticum* and also *castra* which it had been given the right to fortify by the dukes of Apulia,⁵⁵ and yet was not recorded in the *Catalogus Baronum*.

Therefore, either the clerical contingents listed there were simply the result of arbitrary arrangements made by the Norman rulers with some churches, but not others, on no very rational basis, or the *Catalogus* is, at least insofar as clerical fiefs are concerned, incomplete. Perhaps both of these statements are true. Although extremely detailed and where ownership can be checked very accurate, the Catalogue has survived only at third-hand, as a late thirteenth-century copy of an early thirteenth-century copy of the original manuscript. It lacks neither omissions or alterations in the proper order of fiefs, and the likelihood is that some privileged churches have been deliberately ignored.⁵⁶ But on quite what basis the choice was made is by no means clear. There is evidence to suggest that churches other than those listed made enfeoffments themselves, and had a military potential. A charter of William I to La Cava of 1154 gave the abbot and his successors the right to promote vassals of the monastery to knighthood, but unfortunately the document's authenticity, in its present form at any rate, is

ed. G. B. Siragusa (Fonti per la storia d'Italia 22, Rome 1897) p 138. For the tomb of Guiscard, William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum*, ed. W. Stubbs (2 vols, RS 1887-9) 2 p 322.

⁵⁴ Jamison, 'Molise II', *EHR* 45 (1930) pp 22-4, 'Additional work' p 14.

⁵⁵ [P.] Guillaume, *Essai [Historique sur l'Abbaye de Cava (Cava dei Tirreni 1877)]* pp xvii-xviii appendix E (1100), xxvii-xxviii appendix H (1123). L. von Heinemann, *Normannische Herzogs- und Königsurkunden aus Unteritalien und Sizilien* (Tübingen 1899) pp 19-20 no 10 (1111).

⁵⁶ Jamison, 'Additional work' pp 23-56, especially 29, 46-7, & 58. This may be the case with La Cava, which was much favoured by the Norman kings, not least in that it supplied the monks for William II's cherished foundation of Monreale; White, *Latin Monasticism* pp 134-6. Certainly the royal justiciar William of S. Severino, in a charter of 1187, was very careful to distinguish between land of the monastery within his barony of Cilento and the fiefs of that barony; Cava, *Arm. Mag.* L. 21.

Military obligation in Norman Italy

questionable.⁵⁷ Many of its details may however be accurate. The monastery of St. Lawrence, Aversa, which we have already seen making an enfeoffment in return for knight service in 1132, granted fiefs on its lands around Foggia in Apulia to men of knightly status in the 1180s.⁵⁸ A sergeant of the bishop of Aversa witnessed a charter in 1151.⁵⁹ One also wonders whether knights who acted as advocates of churches in legal cases had any formal links with those institutions.⁶⁰ On the other hand we must be careful not to assume that all references to *servitio* and *feuda* in ecclesiastical documents imply *military* obligations. The fiefs of St. Lawrence, Aversa, at Foggia were granted for rent, not service, presumably because the monastery itself lacked obligations to the king. But such terminology was used in a very vague sense in southern Italy. Both in the Campania and in the Abruzzi, even as late as 1200, one can find 'fiefs' which were held by sharecropping arrangements, or in return for food-renders, small money-payments or *corvées*.⁶¹ Even within the military context *feudum* might have different meanings.⁶²

The strongest evidence to suggest that the *Catalogus Baronum* is at best a very incomplete guide to the military potential of the south Italian Church comes in a similar, but much briefer, text which was copied as an appendix by the scribe of the manuscript through which the Catalogue itself has been preserved—a list of the prelates holding fiefs in the Capitanata c1243.⁶³ Most of those named were not included in the *Catalogus*. Many of the fiefs listed were held by laymen in the mid-twelfth century.⁶⁴ In some of these cases one may well be dealing with the phenomenon familiar from the Abruzzi—laymen performing the service owed from

⁵⁷ Guillaume, *Essai* pp xxxv–xxxvi appendix L. Jamison, 'Molise II' pp 10–11.

⁵⁸ *Cod Dipl Aversa* pp 210–211 no 113 (1181), 233–4 no 125 (1184).

⁵⁹ *ibid* pp 102–3 no 59.

⁶⁰ E.g. *Regesto di S. Leonardo di Siponto*, [ed. F. Camobreco (Rome 1913)] p 5 no 4 (1129), 14 no 21 (1144), 15–6 nos 23–4 (1146).

⁶¹ *Reg S. Angelo* pp 137–40 no 49 (1157). *Codice Diplomatico Sulmonese*, ed. N. F. Faraglia (Lanciano 1888) pp 51–2 no 40 (1178), 60–1 no 45 (1201). Ughelli 1 cols 1125–7 (1195).

⁶² Jamison, 'Additional work' pp 9–10.

⁶³ *Cat Bar* arts 1428–42.

⁶⁴ E.g. Montecalvo, held in 1243 by the abbot of S. Elena, in the Catalogue by a layman, *Cat Bar* arts 1428, 385; Casale S. Trifone, held 1243 by the abbot of St. John in Plano, in the mid-twelfth century by Count Godfrey of Lesina, *ibid* arts 1430, 387; Ururi and Illice, held 1243 by the bishop of Larino, earlier by tenants of the Count of Civitate, *ibid* arts 1437, 307, 309.

lands actually owned by a church. We know, for example, from a legal case roughly contemporary with the compilation of the Catalogue, that a man listed in the latter as owing one knight for property at Castiglione near Foggia was in fact a vassal of Montecassino, and according to the court, the abbot was responsible for ensuring that the service was performed, though the Catalogue makes no mention of this.⁶⁵ But in other instances churchmen were said in 1243 to hold fiefs which were not listed in the *Catalogus Baronum*, and which were very clearly in the possession of those churches in the 1150s. Thus the thirteenth-century fief of S. Lorenzo, held by the Bishop of Troia, was one of the properties of that see included in a confirmation of its possessions by William I of 1156, and then held free of regalian obligations, including the *collecta* (financial aids, including those from fiefs).⁶⁶ St. Stephen in Juncarico, a fief held by La Cava in 1243, was in the twelfth century a subordinate cell of the abbey.⁶⁷ The *casale* of Torremaggiore, held by the abbey of that name, was another fief in the 1243 list, although it had been confirmed as being free from all service by Robert Guiscard, and by king Tancred in 1192.⁶⁸

Our conclusions must be two-fold. The *Catalogus Baronum* was as its modern editor has made clear, not an immutable register of obligations, but a document designed to meet a specific situation at a specific time. Military obligations were revised and altered, and the Catalogue was only one of the documents generated by this problem. Other registers of fiefs and service, now lost, were made.⁶⁹ One cannot simply say that assessments were revised under Frederick II, and that heavier military obligations were imposed on the Church during his reign. This was almost certainly true, but new obligations were laid on churches under the Norman kings

⁶⁵ *ibid* art 400. *Le Colonie cassinesi in Capitanata IV Troia*, ed. T. Leccisotti (Miscellanea Cassinese 29, Montecassino 1958) pp 93–5 no 28. English summary by Jamison, 'Norman Administration' pp 432–3 no 37.

⁶⁶ *Cat Bar* art 1433. *Les Chartes de Troia (1024–1266)*, ed. J. M. Martin (Codice Diplomatico Pugliese 21, Bari 1976) pp 239–41 no 75. *Collecta* is a rather ambiguous term in a twelfth-century context, but it certainly includes the feudal aid, Jamison, 'Molise II' pp 8–9, 28–9 doc 5 (1226).

⁶⁷ *Cat Bar* art 1440; Cava, *Arm. Mag.* H.10 (1152), I. 11 (1174).

⁶⁸ Guiscard's diploma of 1067 is known only from that of Tancred, ed. in T. Leccisotti, *Il Monasterium Terrae Maioris* (Montecassino 1942) pp 79–82.

⁶⁹ Note the reference to quaternions of fiefs in the Molise document of 1226 cited above n 66.

Military obligation in Norman Italy

too, and not only in the years immediately after the unification of the *regno* by Roger II. In many cases these were for fiefs owing service to the king obtained by churches. But service might also be required from newly-consolidated blocks of ecclesiastical demesne, perhaps built up from small beginnings. This was probably the case for the service of 20 sailors for the royal fleet from the tenement of S. Lucia from which William II exempted the bishopric of Lipari-Patti in Sicily in 1177.⁷⁰ Another, and clearer, example was S. Severo in Apulia, developed in the twelfth century by the monks of Torremaggiore from an open village into a substantial walled settlement, some of whose inhabitants were of knightly status, with, by the early thirteenth century, its own constable.⁷¹ By the time of Frederick II it was, perhaps hardly surprisingly, no longer treated as the allodial property of the abbot, but as a royal fief.⁷²

All this suggests that churches on which these new obligations were placed were able to fulfil them, and indeed it was because they had the military capacity to fulfil them that they were given such burdens. Not only did the *Catalogus Baronum* conceal ecclesiastical proprietorship of many lands behind a screen of laymen actually performing the military service for such lands, but behind the quotas laid down for the *magna expeditio* of the mid-twelfth century, the south Italian Church was much better able to involve itself in the defence of the kingdom than might at first be supposed. Up to 1140 the Church in Norman Italy was largely absolved from military obligations to lay rulers. But it was not, and never had been, defenceless, and after 1140, albeit in a very unsystematic fashion, the state recognized this and took steps accordingly.

University of Leeds

⁷⁰ Kehr, *Urkunden* pp 444–5 no 24, cf. White, *Latin Monasticism* pp 63, 98.

⁷¹ M. Fuiano, *Città e Borghi in Puglia nel medioevo* (Naples 1972) pp 137–47, 170–2 doc no 11. For the constable, *Regesto di S. Leonardo di Siponto* pp 86–7 no 138 (1203).

⁷² Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, ed. H. R. Luard (7 vols, RS 1872–84) 3 p 555.